



special  
collections  
DOUGLAS  
Library



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA





17521  
J. Buch

A  
S T A T E  
O F  
F A C T S:  
O R A  
S K E T C H  
O F T H E  
C H A R A C T E R  
A N D  
P O L I T I C A L C O N D U C T  
O F T H E  
Right Hon. *C H A R L E S F O X*.

---

“ Non videmus id manticae quod in tergo est.”

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for RICHARDSON and URQUHART, at the Royal-Exchange ; T. EVANS, Strand ; and G. HARLOWE, (Successor to the late Mr. RIDLEY) in St. James's-Street.

M,DCC,LXXXIII.

AC 911.1

18

---

---

A

## STATE of FACTS, &c.

**W**HEN disappointed Ambition invokes the aid of falsehood and malice to blacken the characters of those who have attained that height to which she in vain attempted to soar, or from which she has been precipitated with disgrace, it is commonly her endeavour to persuade the world, that she has formed an alliance with Truth and Candour, that they are her champions, and that whoever opposes her must be a foe to both,

ONE of the most proper means for effecting this insidious purpose has been pitched upon by the author of "The Defence of the EARL of SHELBURNE."

IN the outset of the work we have a sketch of a monster without principle, or the appearance

B

of

of principle ; ambitious and mean ; equally ready to gratify his own vices, and those of others ; substituting craft for candour, subtilty for solidity, fluctuation for firmness ; abandoning integrity for expediency ; hiding the weakness of his projects under the mask of mystery ; concealing the most fixed contempt for genuine friendship, under the shew of personal attachment ; declaring, and denying the declaration ; asserting, and revoking the assertion ; of a temper to accommodate every inconsistency ; above all, a complete master of intrigue, a cloak under which he might like another Proteus assume all shapes, natural and unnatural ; one who will stop short at no impediment to obtain his object ; who would study the leading weakness of his sovereign, and pursue measures he is anxiously bent on, however mistaken or fatal ; who would represent the popularity of a rival as treason against the state, and the dissatisfaction of the people against himself as disaffection to the monarch ; who would do whatever elevated and strengthened his own power, and neglect nothing that tended to degrade or injure his enemies and opponents ; and, to crown the whole, who must be always suspicious of eminent genius or extraordinary merit in others.— If this, says our author, is not the exact resemblance



blance of the EARL of SHELBURNE, the noble Lord comes as nearly to the spirit, as human frailty will allow.

IT must be acknowledged, that the picture is drawn with force and precision ; and as Raphael said, that a good painter must copy the image in his own mind, Mr. Fox has here given a most exact transcript of his own qualities and conduct ; though through a *mistake*, perhaps owing to a blunder of his secretary, the noble EARL's name has been affixed to the piece instead of that of the celebrated Commoner. As the task is easy, I will not venture barely to *say*, but I will *prove*, that CHARLES Fox, in every trait, comes up not only to the spirit, but to the letter of it.

THAT CHARLES Fox should pretend to principle, is a phenomenon that must astonish every one who has ever heard of him.

EDUCATED under the eye of a father famous, to a proverb, for his skill in all the arts of crooked policy, and initiated by him even from infancy in its darkest mysteries, he was early taught both by precept and example to make his own advantage the sole standard of his conduct, and to sail

with every wind. — In such circumstances, had he retained but a moderate share of integrity, he must have been a miracle. He is, indeed, a very extraordinary man, but no miracle ; at least, not of virtue.

In one thing, however, all his father's care was unsuccessful. Nature had implanted in him a strong taste for pleasure, which hurried him into the wildest excesses, and which, as he was set loose from all moral ties, all checks of *conscience*, made him incapable of turning his natural and acquired talents to the main purpose they were wished to answer (that of accumulation) ; so that his very rapacity served merely to feed his profusion, and his versatility of genius only suggested to him ways and means for gratifying his favourite propensities. — Of these, the most fatal was the rage of gaming, which not only swallowed up the immense sum left him by his father, with every guinea that the thirst of gain could wring from the gripe of usury, or the most specious promises could wheedle from unsuspecting credulity ; but even the ill earned pay which he received for being the bully of an Administration\*

\* Lord North's Administration.

which

which he afterwards has not been ashamed to paint as in every respect execrable, and which he at last ruined, by precisely the same arts he once employed in its defence.

It would be impossible, even in many volumes, to describe the scandalous methods of acquiring that money, which the moment he got into his possession he suffered himself to be duped of by the most infamous of mankind, who were almost his only, at least his most frequent, associates.— In short, hundreds in this metropolis have trusted Mr. Fox with their property ; and of those hundreds, how few can be found who have not reason to cry, “ *We have not acted like wise men.\**”

BUT to enter minutely into such an enquiry would be a task equally disagreeable, invidious, and unnecessary. Let us view him in his political conduct, which is the light in which he wishes to be viewed, and in which such incontestible proofs of tergiversation, duplicity, and inconsistency, may be found, as, if not capable of raising a blush on *his* cheek, will at least be sufficient to cover with shame even the boldest of his advocates.

\* Vide The Defence, &c.

IN the first place, however, let us examine the contrast they have been pleased to draw between the noble EARL and MR. FOX.

THE first article is important. MR. FOX is fatigued with and grown into contempt for all external decoration——The EARL of SHELBURNE is not : *Ergo*, MR. FOX is much better qualified for Minister than his Lordship. This is very strange logic. But, say they, it is not unreasonable to assert, “ That if pomp of dress, prettiness of manners, or exterior neatness, constituted much of “ a man’s real dignity, a valet or a hair-dresser “ would stand better chance than John De Witt “ or the Earl of Chatham.” It is granted ; and if a total neglect of dress, manners, and neatness, constituted much of a man’s real dignity, a drayman, a dustman, or a chimney-sweeper would stand a better chance than either of them : the famous *Jeffery Dunstan* would outstrip even CHARLES FOX, and have an irresistible claim to the first dignities on earth.

BUT the truth is, that the sloven and the fop are more nearly allied than most people imagine ; they generally have the same common parent, Vanity ; and an attention to externals is as visible in MR. FOX, when with a greasy coat and uncombed

combed locks he harangues his nether parliament in Westminster-Hall, or his Six-Shilling Club at the Shakespear, on the Majesty of the People, as when decorated with the red-heeled shoe, the white feather, and the embroidered suit, he declaimed against the freedom of *Election*, and dignified his present patrons with the title of the *Scum of the Earth*.

VERSED in all the arts of ambition, he knows that they *who would mount, must stoop as low*; and that whoever would turn the passions and prejudices of the Mob to his advantage, must imitate them in his dress, language, and manners. They then repose unlimited confidence in his promises and assertions; each wifeacre whispers to his neighbour, *He is one of us*: it flatters their vanity, that a man who aspires to the direction of affairs, should reflect their own image; and every individual sees himself, in fancy, steering the helm of state, dictating to his Sovereign, and giving law to the nation.

So much for the article of Dress, which Mr. Fox certainly thinks of the first importance, or he would not have mentioned his wearing a thread-bare

bare coat as the first proof of his superiority in abilities to the EARL of SHELBURNE.

WE are next told, that MR. FOX “ seems so  
 “ averse to the subtilties of life, that he rather  
 “ deters by distance than seduces by familiarity.”  
 And is it really so?—If it is, we must search for proofs in the low houses of entertainment of Westminster, whose greasy inmates he hugged to his bosom, and flattered with incense, though not of the most delicate odour, yet of the kind best adapted to the organs of those *beings* to whom it was offered.

YET to do the gentleman strict justice, I allow that he is naturally haughty and domineering, of a temper rather repellent than conciliating; tho’, when he has any purpose to serve, he has an admirable knack at substituting the smile of complacency for the frown of disdain, or the sneer of contempt; but when that is effected, the Proteus resumes his natural shape.

OF this many instances might be given. On his canvass for Westminster, numberless promises were made, not indeed of places and pensions, but of reimbursement of expences incurred in procuring votes for the MAN OF THE PEOPLE;  
 and

and it may fairly be asked, How many of those to whom MR. Fox had either by himself or his agents made positive promises, he has kept his word with? It may even be questioned, whether he has not been *careless* enough of the honour of his friends to deny having any concern in the transaction, or that it was carried on with his privity or consent. This we may state as one of the instances where MR. Fox is “careless, and “the EARL of SHELBURNE would be cautious;” though it can scarcely be adduced as a proof, that “when he makes an engagement, he would “not violate his faith.” I am, however, bound to confess, MR. Fox does nothing *without design*, and is not obliged by the stipulations of a third person acting in his name without a legal power of attorney: “*He did not find it in the bond;*” and therefore, though they might bleed to death, he was not to be at the charge of healing the wound he had been the occasion of inflicting.

It is true, there are some engagements, not merely verbal, or made by a third person, which MR. Fox has not yet performed: “but who “can assert that he *may* not?” These he certainly has not with his usual *rough* frankness denied; and as a “thing is morally possible,

“ when it is not physically impossible ; as while  
 “ there is life there is hope, and to despair of  
 “ happiness is impiety ;” who knows but there  
 may yet come a time *when the fountains of the*  
*great deep shall be opened,* and the MAN OF THE  
 PEOPLE at the head of the Treasury do honour  
 to all the yet undenied debts of the RIGHT HO-  
 NOURABLE CHARLES FOX.

“ MR. FOX has a respect for the judgement of  
 “ the nation, but looks to the purity of his ac-  
 “ tions for public applause.”

MR. FOX has, indeed, always expressed the  
 highest respect for the judgement of the nation ;  
 but where is that judgement to be found ? One  
 year, it is to be collected no where but within the  
 walls of St. Stephen's Chapel ; the next, that is  
 the only place where it cannot be found. The  
 judgement of the nation is to be collected in Clubs  
 at taverns or alehouses, and the worthy members  
 of those wise societies are the sole depositaries of  
 all the good-sense, honesty, and public spirit to be  
 found among us. — Both of these declarations he  
 has solemnly made : let him shew their consistency,  
 if he can.

As



As to the purity of his actions, witness the whole tenor of his parliamentary conduct, till the Treasury at which he sat, tired with the frequency of his jobs, gave up his support rather than acquiesce longer with them. What was it during the affair of the Middlesex Election? “that Election in which the Constitution was stabbed?” “What was it at the time when the greatest and wisest men in this country affirmed openly in both Houses of Parliament, that the People’s Representatives were traitors, and sold the rights of the nation?”—Who were at that time MR. FOX’s friends, and the subjects of his panegyric? Who were the objects of that asperity, that virulence of language for which he has been always remarkable; and which it seems is now held to be so excellent an accomplishment, that none but they who are possessed of it are qualified for the direction of affairs? With what intrepidity, I had almost said effrontery, did this new MAN OF THE PEOPLE then despise popular clamours? How did he stigmatize those of the contrary party, I will not say those of contrary sentiments; for his sentiments seem always to have been regulated by an immediate or remote view to his own interest? The *People* were then a set of worthless wretches; a filthy herd, on whom the soldiery was to be let

loose, and whose insolence was to be punished by the sword, since it could not be restrained by the law.—The Opposition was composed of a set of vile incendiaries—fowers of sedition—enemies to the most virtuous, the most amiable Sovereign that ever graced a throne, and who was governed by a Minister the most upright, the most enlightened, and the most indefatigable, that ever nation was blest with.

BUT all this, and much more, he trusts is now forgotten ; for, if we may judge of Mr. Fox by his conduct, he still retains the same low idea he ever had of the People, and, like a true politician, smiles in secret at seeing them so ready to become his dupes. If he did not hold them in the utmost contempt; if he looked upon them as men, as endowed with the least portion of reason, with the smallest faculty of recollection, he would never lay claim to consistency of conduct, or the slightest degree of public virtue.

YET this man, we are told, “ has so little  
 “ respect for artifice, that he would censure an  
 “ obnoxious measure even to the Sovereign who  
 “ employed him, with a harshness for which the  
 “ sincerity of his counsel would hardly compen-  
 “ sate.”

“ fate\*.”—How far he is above artifice, especially if he never separates the *public* from the *private*, man, after what the world knows (some few instances of which have been before given), I leave to that world to determine. That he always thinks himself right, or rather desires that others should think him right, I am *willing* to believe. He has shewn the Public in many instances *that he can confute, change sides, and still confute*: in other words, he is above conviction; and considering the situation he has for many years been in with respect to the Sovereign, conscious that he by no means stands high in the royal esteem, either as a private or a public man, it is not in the least incredible, that to the Sovereign himself Mr. Fox should be deficient in the good-manners which decency would require even from one private gentleman to another.

WHAT passed between them in private, or what virulent language his Majesty was obliged to bear from this *Drawcanfir*, *who*, it seems, *snubs kings, drinks, fights, and does what he pleases*, I cannot pretend to say, as I am a stranger to St. James’s, to the Shakespear, and even to all the numerous

\* Vide “ The Defence,”

patriotic societies in and about this metropolis, where, no doubt, he has been highly commended for what they will call *fearing no colours, but giving the King his own*. And how must the man be adored, who, while he has the privilege and spirit to do that, will yet condescend to be President of a Club, where every man is a member that can beg or borrow Six Shillings ! Yet whatever harshness he might use to his royal master in the closet, when he spoke of him in public, his lips dropt honey ; His Majesty was again every thing that was great and good, and Mr. BURKE joined with him in the flattering eulogium \*.

THAT MR. Fox, when opulent, never dreaded indigence, is certainly true. — The violence of his passions prevented him from reflecting, that it was possible his funds might one day be exhausted ; or if such a thought occurred, confidence in his own dexterity and talents assured him of finding a supply. — And, indeed, in this he seems to have been right. Perhaps no man ever shewed more address in eluding the demands of creditors, and securing himself from all the legal effects of their resentment. The privilege of parliament exempted

\* Vide Almon's Debates for 1782, vol. 7. p. 43. and 47.

his person from arrest ; a hired house ready-furnished precluded the danger of an execution ; and gaming, once his folly, has become the principal, if not the only means of his support ; while, though universally known to be one of those who, according to the vulgar phrase, *live intirely by their wits*, he has art enough to persuade the credulous that he still plays merely for amusement.

It is added, “ that he is not wealthy, and yet “ despises riches.” Had it been said, “ he is not “ wealthy, and yet despises œconomy,” the assertion had been just. Deep gamesters never despise riches ; they are haunted with a continual craving for them ; and though the extravagance of their domineering passions may *force* them immediately to dissipate their acquisitions, they can no more be said to despise those acquisitions, than the needy glutton can be said to despise good cheer, who exhausts his store for one entertainment, though he knows not but he may for the remainder of his life be obliged to mortify on bread and water.

How far MR. FOX despises riches, let the Hazard and the Pharo tables witness.—But  
what

what would appear riches to the greatest part of mankind, to his elevated soul are mere trifles.

It is said of the EARL of SHELBURNE, by the Author of *The Defence*, that he never entertains a peevish prejudice for old sentiments, when they are inconvenient. The EARL of SHELBURNE has always acted with a consistency which Mr. Fox has never shewn. He uniformly opposed every measure that tended to bring on a rupture with America; he recommended a conciliation with that country on the terms of the fullest freedom; he would indulge them in every thing except a separation from Great Britain, judging that a union between the two countries founded on just and liberal principles, would be a lasting blessing to both.

Mr. Fox, on the contrary, after going every length with those who favoured the American war, till a rupture was unavoidable, suddenly shifted sides, and became as violent an opposer of any plan for preventing the disunion of America, as he had before been for the taxation of it. So far, indeed, has he carried his resentment against his quondam friends, as to  
aim

aim a blow at them through the sides of his country ; as to insist upon America being separated for ever from Great Britain, and thrown into the arms of her perpetual enemies. It was for him and his friends to discover, that the depriving of more than a million of people of the rights of British subjects was conferring a benefit on them.

THIS MR. Fox himself must be conscious to be the true state of the case ; and whoever will take a view of the parliamentary transactions of those times, will, in spite of the most violent prejudices, be compelled to acknowledge it.

LET us then, by the best and most public vouchers that can be procured, trace the conduct of each, from the first time that MR. Fox appeared in parliament to the present hour, and from thence form an estimate of the merit of the two characters.

IN the beginning of the year 1770, the heats which prevailed in the nation, on account of the former Administration, both at home and with regard to America, were risen to such a pitch, as to threaten an insurrection : not only the DUKE of GRAFTON shrunk from the helm,

D

but

but the whole Administration seemed falling to pieces. It was at that time Lord NORTH took the lead, and Mr. Fox accepted a place as one of the Lords of the Admiralty, under an Administration, the avowed intention of which was to cram down the throats of the nation measures which were almost universally execrated, as the most unconstitutional that had been attempted since the time of the Revolution.

Of all those, that of the Middlesex Election was deemed one of the most obnoxious. The Opposition, composed of men most of whom Mr. Fox has of late years extolled in the highest terms of panegyric, delivered their sentiments on the subject in the clearest manner, and enforced them with such arguments as could not fail of convincing every man of integrity, who had the least portion of common sense. But did they carry conviction to Mr. Fox? Certainly not. His eyes were then shut to the light of truth, his ears were deaf to the voice of reason. He had not yet tasted the fruits of the tree of knowledge to enable him to discern good from evil. Was that really the case? and shall we say, that a distinguished orator as Mr. Fox certainly then was, may yet be incapable of comprehending  
the



the plainest truths delivered in the most energetic and clearest language? If it be so, what must we say of his head? If it was not so, if he spoke and voted against his secret conviction, what must we say of his heart?

ON the 30th of January of that year, the House having resolved itself into a Committee on the state of the nation, a motion was made, " That it ought to judge of Elections by the law " of the land, and by the custom and practice " of parliament, which made part of that law ;" a truth so manifest, that it could not be negatived. But though not negatived it might be crushed, and in such a way, that it should no more rise to torment them; a mill-stone might be hung about its neck, which would sink it for ever;—nay, do more, even vest Parliament with that alarming power, at the bare mention of which the nation was at once struck with horror, and fired with indignation. An amendment was proposed to be added in these words: " And that " the judgment of this House in the case of " John Wilkes, was agreeable to the law of the " land, and fully authorized by the practice of " parliament." It was put to the vote, and carried by a majority of 224 to 180.

LET this upright MAN OF THE PEOPLE stand forth, and declare on which side he spoke, on which side he voted, upon this occasion; and let him declare, if he can without a blush, whether he was not active in the successful endeavour next night, in the same Committee of the whole House, to elude another motion equally important\*: “That by the law of the land, “and the known law and customs of parliament, “no person eligible by common right can be “*incapacitated* by vote or resolution of that House, “but by act of parliament only.”

How different from his conduct was that of the EARL of SHELBURNE at that period! The same affair was warmly debated† in the House of Lords, during the whole progress of which, in its several stages, the noble Earl stood forth the friend of the constitution, and exerted himself, in conjunction with other ‡ *Peers* of great honour and integrity, in resisting the several measures that were then taken.

\* Journ. H. Comm.

† Ann. Reg. for 1770.

‡ Lord Rockingham and others.

THESE respectable characters, as soon as they had the power, performed what they had promised. One of the first steps taken in their administration, was procuring the erasure of the obnoxious Resolutions of 1769, and thus restoring to the People their undoubted and constitutional Rights of Election.

ON this occasion, let us observe what was the conduct of MR. Fox. He opposed \* the motion for expunging the Resolutions for MR. WILKES's expulsion, and respecting his incapacity of being re-elected :

“ BECAUSE, after turning the question often in  
 “ his mind, he was still convinced that the prin-  
 “ ciple on which the House then proceeded was  
 “ proper. It was for the good of the People of  
 “ England that the House should have a power  
 “ of *expelling* any man whom the Representatives  
 “ of the People of England thought unworthy to  
 “ sit among them.”

THE artful substitution of the word *expelling* for *incapacitating*, cannot here escape the atten-

\* Almon's Debates, vol. VII. for 1782.

tion of the reader. If, as he professed, he had revolved the question in his mind full thirteen years, and yet could not with all his acumen distinguish between *expulsion* and *incapacitation*, when it plainly appears from the words of the Resolution, if referred to, that they were considered by the then House of Commons to be as distinct as Cause and Effect; and the MARQUIS of GRANBY, twelve years ago, clearly pointed out this distinction by honourably and liberally acknowledging his error\*, and making the best atonement for it in his power, by openly lamenting the vote he gave on the Middlesex Election as the greatest misfortune of his life—(an example which it would surely have been an honour to Mr. Fox to have followed) must we not conclude him still in his political childhood?

But he must be acquitted of such imbecility. In proportion to his esteem for his own discernment, is his contempt for that of others; and he thought he might by this artful juggle, especially after such a length of time, pass among his friends without doors, as having only defended the uncontroverted privilege enjoyed

\* Ann. Reg. 1770.

joyed by the House of Commons, of *expelling* any of their body, who, after an election, shall have been convicted of an enormity in their opinion deserving that mark of disgrace.

BUT to proceed with MR. Fox's speech. He said, this privilege of *expulsion* was too valuable to be given up. Certainly it is; but *expulsion* is not the question:—the matter in debate is, Whether a vote of the House of Commons shall deprive Englishmen of the freedom of electing any man for their representative qualified by law? Whether it can deprive that Representative of a privilege to which he is entitled by law?

THIS is vesting the legislative authority in one House of Parliament; and if the Commons alone can *incapacitate* a man qualified by law from a seat in their House, why not *incapacitate* another qualified by law from giving a vote for a Member to sit in that House?

MR. Fox carries it farther. He asserts, that the House of Commons can by a single Resolution, not only without the concurrence, but against the consent of the other two branches of the legislature, exclude whole classes of men  
from

from their legal privilege of sitting in that House ;  
 and says, in *some cases*, “ the public utility of  
 “ that power would be felt and acknowledged.  
 “ If the Bill for excluding Contractors from seats  
 “ in that House had been rejected in the other ;  
 “ and the House of Commons should come to a  
 “ resolution of their own, that no person holding  
 “ a contract should sit amongst them, the present  
 “ Contractors losing their seats might be re-  
 “ elected ; and then, if not prevented by this  
 “ inherent privilege of the House to *expel* (mean-  
 “ ing to incapacitate), the very men whom the  
 “ House should have deemed improper to sit  
 “ among them, might be returned again.”

THE example was well chosen, and, considering the odium against Contractors, especially at present, the best he could have brought to satisfy the *Million*, who, if they see the objects of their resentment punished, give themselves little trouble about the legality or justice of the means by which it has been effected.

THE Thirty Tyrants who exercised such cruelties at Athens, began with putting to death by their own authority persons who were most notorious for their crimes. These being the ob-  
 objects

jects of universal detestation, the people rejoiced and applauded their new Governors, for the speedy and effectual justice they had done on criminals, who might by their artifices or interest have baffled every legal attempt to bring them to condign punishment.—But the citizens soon had reason to repent of their ill-timed approbation. The precedent once established, they were themselves indiscriminately dragged to the new tribunal, and, according to its arbitrary *Resolution*, fined, imprisoned, banished, or put to death.

THIS, though on a larger scale, is exactly the line of conduct MR. Fox thinks the House of Commons has a right to pursue.—A Resolution of theirs may in *some cases* deprive an individual, or any class of individuals, of their legal franchise; in other words, lay them under a partial attainder.

LET us suppose an enterprising Minister, with a majority of the House of Commons at his devotion; might it not be in his power, with a little management, to *expel*, that is, in MR. Fox's language, *incapacitate* from holding a seat in Parliament, any Member at whom he took umbrage, till at last every shadow of opposition

should vanish ?——This was one of Cromwell's artifices. The House of Commons was *purged* by degrees, till none were left that dared to oppose his measures : the consequence was, he deprived the King of his life, and the People of their liberties.—From what has been said it appears, that such a privilege would open a door to consequences equally fatal to the Representatives and the Represented :—this is, however, the doctrine of the MAN OF THE PEOPLE ; it is thus this pretended Champion of their Rights and Liberties covertly aims a deadly blow at both.

I have insisted the longer upon this, as the poison was so artfully concealed, that it escaped the notice of most people, especially without doors.—Yet we see, that Mr. Fox has not, however artfully disguised, got rid of those maxims convenient for a Minister who would wish to bend a Parliament to his will, which he imbibed in what he or his friends are now pleased to call his POLITICAL CHILDHOOD.—Indeed, his situation was at this time critical. As yet, he was far from being firmly fixed in his new station, therefore afraid of disobliging his new friends and the People ; which would have ruined him irrecoverably. But this he must certainly have done,  
had



had he opposed Mr. WILKES's Motion with his usual vigour. He therefore, with great address, after a faint defence of his old opinion, declared, he felt very little anxiety for the event of the question : he *believed* the voice of the People was against it at *present* ; and therefore he would not preserve that privilege, to make use of it against the People, which was originally intended for the preservation of their liberties.

It seems, therefore, MR. Fox never discovered that the voice of the People was against it till the month of May 1782 ;—and even then, he only *believed* it to be so. Was there ever a more Jesuitical piece of tergiversation ? He felt little anxiety for the event of the question, though it was, Whether the House should be deprived of a privilege which he had just before affirmed to be too valuable to be given up ?—Where is his regard for the House ? — But he owns likewise, that it was a privilege which might be turned against the People, i. e. against the liberty of the People ; yet he is indifferent, though it be still preserved.—Where is his regard for the People ? — Thus it is that cunning and duplicity always over-reach themselves ! He endeavoured to escape through

the windings of a labyrinth in which he bewildered himself.

BUT to palliate the matter, he adds, “ What signifies retaining the privilege, when the power to enforce it is gone?—Now the power is gone: witness the House not daring to inflict the deserved punishment on two of its Members \*, who, as Magistrates of London, had grossly violated the privileges of the House.”——He consents, then, that the privilege shall not be retained?—Not so: tho’ the Resolutions be expunged, the doctrine remains just as before.—Here is candour! here is frankness! here is the open unreserved language of a heart which disdains every artifice! No mystery here!—all plain and clear, luminous as the sun!

BUT MR. FOX was haranguing two very different classes of men at the same time, and speaking a quite contrary language to each.

To the House, and to those Members who were zealous for the advancement of its power, he spoke thus:

“ IT is well known what my sentiments on this subject have been: they are not in the least al-

\* Aldermen Crosby and Oliver.

tered. The privilege of excluding, by a Resolution of our own, whom we please from a seat among us, whatever might be his title by law, is too valuable to be given up. It is an engine which in proper hands may be turned to advantage, even against our Constituents, should they be hardy enough to find fault with our conduct.

“BUT it is execrated by the People. They call upon us to renounce it, and, as a mark of that renunciation, to expunge the Resolutions of 1769.—Comply with their request; it is a matter of no consequence; for the expunging of those Resolutions leaves the doctrine just as it was. You dare not, considering the temper of the times, venture to enforce it at present; suffer them therefore to think the claim renounced, while it is only dormant; it will be still in your power to revive it, when opportunity serves.

AT the same time to the Public he held this language:—“I have always been of opinion, it was for the good of the People that the House of Commons should have the power of expelling any man whom the Representatives of the People thought unworthy to sit among them. Its utility is plain from a recent case, which every one must recollect. Had the other House

refused to pass the Contractors Bill, this privilege would still have enabled the Commons by their own authority to prevent them from having seats in Parliament. Yet though professing such sentiments, he cheerfully submitted to their pleasure, finding it to be the voice of the People that it should be renounced; nor would he, in contradiction to that voice, preserve a privilege which was originally intended for the preservation of their liberties. They no longer acknowledged it. They had associated; they had taught their Representatives to listen to their voice; and to that voice he promised always to listen with the most profound respect."

HERE the Gordian Knot is untied, the mystery is unravelled, the obscurity is removed, and what seemed before confused and perplexed, is now distinct and plain.

I MUST now congratulate Mr. Fox on his imitable ingenuity and address in being able to hold different languages, at the same time conveying quite contrary sentiments, each entirely consistent with itself, and suited to the taste of those on whom it was designed to make the proper impression. This was reserved for his superior genius.

MR.

MR. Fox in parliament, in the year 1771, used these remarkable words : “ I have heard a great deal of the People, and the cries of the People; but where or how am I to find these complaints ? As far as my enquiries have led me, these complaints do not exist ; *for as long as the Majority of this House continues to think otherwise, (who are the People, by being their legal Representatives) I shall think with them.*”—Almon’s Debates from 1770 to 1772, vol. 4.

How consistent is this with those appeals he has since made from the voice of the Majority in the House of Commons, to that of the People assembled in Westminster-Hall ? Yet it must be acknowledged, that this cannot be alledged as an instance of his declaring and denying the declaration, of his asserting and revoking the assertion ; for to this day he has done neither the one nor the other.

It is true, that notwithstanding this vow of allegiance and implicit faith given to the Majority of the House of Commons, he has taken another of the same kind to the People without doors. Yet though these two bodies are very often of different sentiments, he can find means to reconcile to his conscience a promise of obedience to both.

IN 1770, we see that he was deaf to the cries of seventeen Counties\*, backed by those of the City of London, besides a vast number of other Cities and Boroughs. In 1782 he is alive to the complaints of Clubs assembled at Taverns and Ale-houses.

AT the former period Mr. Fox, however, gave in his Political Creed : he was at that time a Papist in politics, and his Pope was the Majority. He saw with the eyes of the Majority ; he heard with the ears of the Majority. The thoughts of the Majority were his thoughts. The voice of the Majority was his voice. The Majority was the Puppet of the Minister ; the HON. CHARLES Fox was the echo of the Puppet. In 1770, he had not a single idea of his own contrary to the sense of the Majority ; they spoke, and he spoke ; they voted, and he voted. The Majority said, the People were a rabble ; an ignorant multitude, incapable of judging ; the scum of the earth : and Mr. Fox echoed, *scum of the earth* †.

IN this state of political idiotism he continued for nearly six years. Who could have thought

\* Petitions were presented by seventeen Counties, the City of London, &c.—Vide Ann. Reg. 1770.

† Ann. Reg. ubi sup.

that this man was one day destined to be the sole hope of his Country ; that on his being in or out of office, depended the salvation or destruction of Great-Britain.

BUT may it not be asked, whether this implicit deference was entirely sincere ? Had Mr. Fox at that time no qualms of conscience with regard to the part he was acting ? Was he totally unconscious of his dignity as a British Senator ? I will even add, as a man ; for what can be more derogatory from either, than such a declaration as he then made ?

THE next business of national concern that was brought into the House, after discussing the affair of the Middlesex Election, was the bill for disqualifying certain Revenue-Officers from voting for Members of Parliament.

THIS bill, or one of a similar tendency, was lately revived.

THE arguments used in 1770 and 1782 were nearly the same ; but at the latter period he adopted as demonstration, those reasonings which at the former he had represented as in the last degree inimical to the Liberties of the Country.

ON March 5, 1770\*, a most important debate came on, in consequence of a Petition presented by the American Merchants, setting forth the losses they had sustained, and the fatal effects of the late laws, which, for the purpose of raising a revenue, had imposed duties upon goods exported from Great Britain thither.

THE Ministry, upon this, brought in a bill for taking off the duties on paper, painters colours, and glass, continuing the tax upon tea. Nothing could be more extraordinary than the conduct they observed upon this occasion. At the very time they condemned these duties in the gross, and stigmatized the laws by which they were imposed; as so preposterous and absurd, that it must perplex every reasonable man to reconcile how they could have originated in a British Legislature; they most inconsistently contended for retaining part of those very duties. The ill consequences of which it would be productive, were painted in the strongest colours; consequences, as we now find by woeful experience, too fatal to the honour and interest of Great Britain. But as the Ministry was inconsistent, the Majority resolved to be so too; and MR. FOX, not having yet his eyes opened, blindly followed the Majority.

\* Vid. Ann. Reg.



HIS conduct was the same, when, on May the 8th, a motion was made, but over-ruled, for an Address to the Throne, praying that the causes of the American disputes and complaints might be again enquired into, and such measures taken, as would replace things there upon their original footing. It was the same with regard to a string of motions, tending to remove all jealousy and discontents of the Colonies against the Parliament, all of which were rejected by a great Majority\*.

NOR was he at that time more a friend to the Rights and Liberties of Ireland, than to those of America ; witness his conduct when the affairs of that nation came under the consideration of the British House of Commons†.

ABOUT the month of November 1769, a money-bill which had been framed in the Privy-Council, was brought into the Irish House of Commons, where it was rejected by a large majority, as a flagrant violation of their most essential rights. By it, they said, the power of granting money to the Crown as a free gift, was attempted to be

\* Almon's Debates, vol. 4. p. 343—346.

† Ann. Reg. 1770, p. 86.

taken from them ; and if it was no longer in their power, by conferring favours on it, to obtain from it benefits for the People, they could no longer act as a medium to preserve the connection or support the confidence between them.

THAT it was degrading them to the state of mere registers of the edicts of the Privy-Council ; which representing no man, nor body of men, could have no right to tax the People ; and whose members being themselves represented in parliament, where all taxes must originate, were equally bound with all others, and by the same authority.

YET that the national supply might not be impeded, another money-bill was passed in the usual form for the expences of two years, though the rejected bill provided only for the expenditure of three months.

NOTWITHSTANDING this liberality, which the Lord-Lieutenant accepted ; in a speech made to both Houses, he condemned, in the strongest terms, the rejection of the Privy-Council money-bill, which he said was intrenching upon the rights of the Crown ; and took the extraordinary measure of entering a formal protest against that  
Act

Act in the Journals of the House of Lords ; a measure of which there never had been but two examples, one by the Earl of STRAFFORD, the other by Lord SIDNEY ; neither of which, it was contended, could be drawn into a precedent, considering the difference of the times or circumstances.

IMMEDIATELY upon this, the Lord-Lieutenant prorogued the Parliament to a long day, though they had done nothing but vote the supply, and an augmentation of the troops ; and a number of Acts of the utmost importance to the welfare of the people were then expired\*.

THIS proceeding of his Lordship threw Ireland into a state of universal confusion and disorder ; and it being a matter of the greatest importance, a motion was made in the British House of Commons, that the instructions under which the Irish Parliament was prorogued might be laid before the House, but it was lost on a division, by a majority of 140 to 66.

LET MR. FOX answer, whether he gave his vote for an enquiry into this odious measure, by which the clamours, the fears, and apprehensions

\* Vide Almon's Debates for 1779, vol. 3. p. 327, &c.  
of

of the Irish, for the loss of that which every free people reckon inestimable, might have been quieted ; and by which harmony and confidence between the two nations might in a great measure, if not intirely, have been restored ; but the Minister was against it, and consequently MR. Fox. He even opposed the bill for regulating the trials on controverted Elections, commonly known by the name of “ MR. GRENVILLE’S bill,” though its salutary effects have been so universally felt and acknowledged \*.

IN this, his voice was contrary to that of the Majority ; the measure of resisting the bill being too profligate, even for those men who had before gone such lengths. The Majority and the Minister were of course on different sides : MR. Fox was, however, resolved at all events, to stick by the latter.

THE conduct of the Ministry in the affair of Falkland-Island was disgraceful in the extreme, sacrificing the honour of the Country to the pride of Spain. Yet even here MR. Fox, as usual, attempted a vindication of his patron, whose will was law to him : and surely, never slave more

\* Almon’s Debates, vol. 3. p. 304.

implicitly obeyed the commands of a master, than MR. Fox then did those of Lord NORTH.

IN short, there was no transaction, however unjustifiable, which he would not with alacrity support, if he was ordered. It would be an endless task to recount them all ; but his behaviour with respect to the Duke of PORTLAND was of a kind too flagrant to be omitted.

I ALLUDE here to the measure of granting to Sir James Lowther a very considerable estate in the County of Cumberland, which had been for more than seventy years in the possession of his Grace's family, under a grant from King William ; which measure MR. Fox supported in Parliament with every exertion in his power. It was, however, too flagrant for the County to endure, and gave occasion to the Baronet to whom a Pamphlet on the subject is addressed, to introduce a bill for quieting the possession of the subject against claims of the Crown of a tendency so iniquitous and detestable.

THE Court opposed this bill with their whole weight and influence, and it was rejected by a Majority of *nine* ; MR. Fox with more than ordinary violence asserting, that on such an occasion he thought it disgraceful for any man who had  
the

the faculty of speech to sit silent : that he could scarce persuade himself any thing so bad, so violent, so lawless, so monstrous, could be introduced by men of character or abilities. But he could not remain long undecided, and then he was struck dumb with astonishment. He was seized with horror and indignation.—“ Who, “ continued he, that has a conscience to revere “ justice, a sense of liberty, or a regard for the “ Constitution, can listen without feeling an honest “ zeal to defeat a proposition which at one blow “ destroys our Constitution, our Liberty, and our “ Laws ?—Gentlemen are loud in their clamours “ against Ministerial Influence. I avow the *syste-* “ *matic* support of that Minister, who has my good “ opinion and *confidence*.——It is under the law “ that every man holds his property, and enjoys “ his liberty in security and ease. But I firmly “ believe, that no man can have a better title to “ an estate than the very title which the Crown “ has vested in Sir James Lowther to the estate “ in question :”—adding, that his *conscience* would never suffer him to be at rest, was he to perpetrate the injustice intended by this bill.

TIMES are changed ! The Duke of PORTLAND is now his friend : and as in the one case he wanted to revive an obsolete odious prerogative, to sacrifice

crifice the security and quiet of the People in order to plunder him; so does he at the present time endeavour to deprive the Crown of its most essential right, that of choosing its own servants, in order to aggrandize him.

THESE, it must be acknowledged, are acts of friendship of which the EARL of SHELBURNE will readily own he is utterly incapable.

AMBITION is MR. Fox's ruling passion. He made use of his Grace in both instances, as a means by which he hoped to exalt himself. Like an Egyptian priest, it was indifferent to him whether the idol was the victim, or the victim the idol, provided he could find his account in offering the sacrifice.

FARTHER enormities recommended him to the Treasury-Bench. Among these may be reckoned his conduct in the affair of the Printers, for the releasing of whom the Lord Mayor (Mr. Crosby) and Alderman Oliver were committed to the Tower; for which MR. Fox declared, both of them ought to be incapacitated:—his opposition to the bringing in of a bill, that in matter of libel Juries were not only to decide with re-

gard to the fact, but the law :——his complaint in the House on the 28th March, 1771, that the Sheriff did not employ the military to disperse a mob who had insulted him in Palace-Yard :——his vindication of the Treasury sending lists to their friends, whom they were to ballot for to be Members of a Committee.

THE first sign he gave of defection from that Minister whose nod he had hitherto so carefully obeyed, was on a motion being made for making MR. GRENVILLE's bill concerning Elections perpetual. ——Both Lord NORTH and he opposed it ; but Mr. Fox took care to let the world know that he had then emancipated himself from his Lordship's tutelage ; and that though he voted with him, it was for very different reasons.—He then, for the first time, turned head against his patron, and made him feel the sharpness of that vituperative eloquence, which had hitherto been employed only against such objects as his Lordship had pointed out.

BUT the die was not yet cast ; and though he pulled off the mask, and shewed his contempt for the Minister, he still voted for what he knew was agreeable to the Court. Fully conscious of  
his



his own importance, he thought he could yet make them submit to his own terms, and would not proceed to such lengths as might preclude a possibility of reconciliation.

IN the same light we may look upon his conduct on occasion of the famous Boston Port Bill.—He found no fault with shutting up the port, but again took occasion to sneer at the Minister, by objecting to those clauses which impowered the Crown to open it again, when proper satisfaction should be made.

THIS, I believe, was the last act in which he even *partially* acceded to the Court.—In the beginning of the next session, he appeared as violent in opposition to, as he had before been in support of, it.

THE motive for his defection has been already alluded to. It was certainly not an honourable one. To those even who are not acquainted with the particulars, it must be clear they did not originate in a public ground. For this we have the clearest evidence, that of Mr. Fox himself, who in all his speeches in the beginning of 1775, and indeed from that period to the present, has openly avowed a personal resentment to his Lordship.

One of these, which was made 25th January 1775, is so remarkable, that I cannot forbear quoting it.—Lord NORTH having said in the course of the debate, that though Mr. Fox now discovered in him so much incapacity and negligence, there was a time when he approved of at least some part of his conduct ;—Mr. Fox, in reply, began with the following words :

“ THAT my private resentments have not affected my public conduct, will readily be believed, when I might long since have justly charged him with the most unexampled treachery and falsehood.”

THE House called to order, grew clamorous, and Mr. Fox sat down twice or thrice ; but so entirely had his private resentments taken possession of his mind, that, on rising each time, he repeated the same words.—At last, however, finding he could not be heard on this topic, which evidently lay nearest to his heart, he adverted to his Lordship’s public conduct ; charged him with negligence, incapacity, and inconsistency ; and added, that though he at one time approved part of his conduct, he never approved of *it all*.—He charged all the disputes with  
Ame-

America to his negligence and incapacity:—that is, he had not persecuted the Americans with sufficient violence, and crushed them at once. What a friend to the Rights and Liberties of his now favourite Americans, was Mr. Fox at that time!

BUT how came it that Mr. Fox never discovered Lord NORTH's incapacity for filling his station, till his Lordship had given him cause for personal resentment?—How did it happen, that till that period Mr. Fox found no fault with the principles on which the Minister acted; but only blamed him, if he blamed him at all, for not pursuing those principles with more vigour?—Must not patriotism which exerts itself in such circumstances, be ever held in suspicion by all the thinking part of mankind?—Repeated offers of conciliation were held out by the Ministry to America; and on every occasion of that kind, he was sure to fill their minds with the most alarming fears and jealousies of his Lordship's Duplicity and Artifice, whom he represented in the same breath as a mere driveller, and as one of the most deep designing men that ever existed.

BUT

BUT wherefore all this? Not out of regard to America, nor to Great Britain, but to thrust out his rival, and procure the management of affairs to himself and his new coadjutor MR. BURKE.—Of this we have a remarkable instance in that extraordinary expression he made use of on the defeat of Cornwallis: “That he grieved at every success, and rejoiced at every disaster which befel his Country in the course of the war, because the one tended to fix, the other to remove a Minister against whom he owned the strongest personal pique.”—Was not this tantamount to saying, that he should grieve at the salvation of his Country, if his Lordship was its saviour; he should rejoice at its destruction, if that destruction drew down vengeance on his enemy?

I know that many unprincipled Politicians have felt a secret joy at the calamities brought upon their Country by their rivals for power and place; but I believe MR. FOX is the only man who ever openly avowed it.—And is this the language of a Patriot! Of a modern Patriot it may be; but it would have been looked upon as that of a Traitor, in Greece or Rome.

WHAT

WHAT we have already said will be sufficient to display MR. Fox in his true light as to his political character, and shew how little he is to be depended upon, even by that People whose cause he pretends to espouse. At one time we have seen him maintaining the privilege of Parliament, and even of one House of Parliament, against the dearest right of the People, that of being represented by the MAN OF THEIR CHOICE, when qualified by Law : at another, we find him insisting, that that House has not a voice of its own; that it is to wait for the determinations of Clubs, Associations, and Meetings without doors, and implicitly obey them:—and that the Members of those Constitutional Meetings might give greater weight to their resolves, he exhorts them to come armed.—How MR. Fox can reconcile these tenets, or what interpretation he will put upon the dark expressions he has made use of with regard to the promoting an aristocratic influence in Elections, must be left to himself.

THE charges already brought are well authenticated; and they prove that MR. Fox has shifted sides alternately, and varied his opinion as his interest led him. One instance more we shall give

give of his consistency, with regard to the shortening of Parliaments. This is a measure which has long been a favourite with the People ; but MR. Fox uniformly took the ministerial side on that business for many years after he entered into Opposition, I think till the year 1780, when he spoke for it, to gratify his friends ; but in so faint a manner, as plainly shewed, to borrow his own expression on another occasion, “ that he felt little anxiety how the question was determined ;” the whole purport of his speech tending rather to manifest his hatred of the Minister, than his approbation of the measure.

So much for this Gentleman’s conduct in public and private life, by which he has demonstrated himself to have every qualification Machiavel would require, not only in a Minister, but even in a Prince.

If we trace the EARL OF SHELBURNE’S conduct through the same period, we shall find it uniformly consistent : the principles he set out with, he has invariably adhered to. We have already seen his behaviour in the grand affair of Elections. To the taxation of America he has always been a foe, and much more to its coercion. At  
the

the time of passing the Boston Port Bill ; that pernicious measure, whence all our calamities have flowed ; though Mr. Fox was far from reprobating its principle, provided the Parliament would not entrust his Majesty's then Ministers with the power of opening it ; the Earl of SHELBURNE in the most explicit manner declared his disapprobation of the whole proceedings with regard to America : he shewed that they tended to make her throw off her dependance, and separate herself for ever from the Mother-Country ; a circumstance, which, he then declared, would be most unfortunate to Great-Britain, and which he now laments with the sincerest concern.

ALL mortal things have their decay ; but they who hasten their own dissolution, even though they may be sure that the disease is incurable, as the Author of *The Defence* has rightly observed, are guilty of suicide ; and the physician who hastens that dissolution, is to all intents and purposes a murderer.

IT is asserted by Mr. Fox's friends, that he has a peculiar faculty at making concessions with a good grace : witness those humiliating ones he made to the Dutch, which, however, they rejected

with contempt. He humbled himself to the French, and the French received his humiliation, without allowing him to profit from it. He fell at the feet of America, and America spurned him from her. What a misfortune for a new Minister, who had positively asserted to the People, that he had a peace in his pocket!—The assertion had the weight it was designed to have within doors, and without.—The **EARL OF SHELBURN**E attempted no such impositions.

THE difference respecting the Independence of America between him and the noble **EARL** was, whether it should be granted to America without any consideration, or made a condition in a Treaty. It need hardly be mentioned, that **MR. FOX** contended for the former proposition, and his Lordship for the latter. Let the world now judge what foundation there is for the charge brought against the Minister, of duplicity to the Parliament, and treachery to his friends, in this matter.

A POINT which **MR. FOX** labours most of all, is to persuade the world, that he resigned his office on public grounds. He asserts, that while **LORD ROCKINGHAM** was yet alive, he had declared an intention to quit his office, on a difference of opinion arising between **LORD SHELBURN**E and the



the Cabinet. Such an intention was, however, expressed only in private, and with a reservation under which he might continue in office, if it should suit his views. The day after the death of the noble Marquis, he declared in the House of Commons, that the Ministers were a set of able and virtuous men, not to be separated by any stroke of fate. He had then hopes, it is evident, of being able to compel his Sovereign to take a Minister selected by the Rockingham party; but on finding his mistake, and understanding the present Minister was to be placed at the head of the Treasury, he immediately gave up the seals.

PUTTING all these circumstances fairly together, what man of common sense but must with the noble EARL “ be of opinion, that his appointment to the first seat at the Treasury Board “ was the sole cause of the Right Honourable “ Gentleman’s secession ?”

THERE was another point, which, it is probable, Mr. Fox had more at heart than even the Independence of America; and that was, such an enlargement of the powers of the Cabinet as should reduce the KING to a mere cypher, and secure to him and his colleagues a perpetuity of that power he had from his youth so eagerly

pursued ; and which, now that he had it in his grasp, both he and they were under the most fearful apprehensions of one day losing. In these views the EARL of SHELBURNE could not concur. He said, that he had imbibed from his master the EARL of CHATHAM an opinion, that this Country ought not to be governed by a party or faction : that if it was to be so governed, the constitution must necessarily expire. On these principles he always acted ; they were not newly taken up for ambitious purposes.

HIS Lordship, in the debate on the 10th of July, put the House in mind of what he had on a former occasion said, while in Opposition, with respect to a KING of the MAH-RATTAS ; and added, “ These being his principles, it was natural for him to stand up for the prerogative of the Crown, and insist upon the KING’s right to appoint his own servants. That if the power which others wished to assume, of vesting in the Cabinet the whole authority should once be established, the KING would have nothing of the Sovereignty but the name ; the Monarchical part of the constitution would be absorbed by the Aristocracy. It was his adherence to these principles that had drawn upon him some recent attacks, and fastened upon him the imputation

tion of designs which he had never harboured. It was this adherence to consistency, that had caused the late separation in the Cabinet ; for the truth of which he appealed to the members of that Cabinet. America had nothing to do in the affair, and they could not contradict his Lordship's assertion." Where, then, is this treachery to his friends, which is so loudly exclaimed against ?

HIS Lordship has proved the falsehood of MR. Fox's assertion, that the people of America would be backward to treat with him for peace : he has proved the truth of his own, that there was no man with whom they would more willingly treat than himself ; and made good his declaration of the 10th of July, that nothing was farther from his thoughts than to renew the war in that country.

WHAT has been said of the Duke of GRAFTON, is entirely foreign to the purpose ; and, besides, comes with a very ill grace from any friend of MR. Fox.

WHATEVER the Duke of GRAFTON's demerits may be, MR. Fox must acknowledge, that he was active in support of every unpopular measure adopted by his Grace. From the moment of  
his

his coming into Parliament to the time of that Nobleman's resignation, and for near five years after, he was active in the prosecution of the same plan. *Quorum pars magna fui*, is what MR. FOX must say to himself, every time the Duke of GRAFTON's or Lord NORTH's Administration is mentioned. What makes the charge against the EARL of SHELBURNE still more absurd is, that the Duke of GRAFTON actually came in with the new Administration. All the members of that Administration who thought proper to keep their places, have retained them, and his Grace happens to be in that number. But why did not the Author of *The Defence* at the same time accuse his Grace of RICHMOND and Lord Viscount KEPPEL of treachery, in not seceding with the Right Honourable Secretary? They are certainly culpable equally in this respect with the noble Earl.

THE shameful and slanderous charge brought against the Majority of the People, as a race of tyrannical, ferocious cowards, actuated by a lust of dominion; delighting in blood, yet shrinking from the least appearance of danger; is of a piece with the rest of the charges brought by the Author of *The Defence*. But the moderation, the bravery, and the humanity of the English  
are

are too well known, their reputation on those points are too well established, to suffer the least tarnish from so groundless, so infamous a piece of malice.

THE next charge against his Lordship is of a very extraordinary kind; no less, than that he intends to spread the “Mantle of Ministerial Impunity over the East India Delinquents.”—What is meant by the Mantle of Impunity? The trope may be sublime, for aught I know; it has indeed one of MR. BURKE’S requisites for the sublime—it is obscure; and that Gentleman has assured us, in a very elaborate treatise, that *darkness* is the sublimest *light* in which a horrible object can be viewed.—This Mantle of Impunity, then, we will allow to be a most horrible thing, especially as it is *Ministerial*. But what evidence have we that the noble Earl intends to spread it over the East India Delinquents, or any others?—Has he avowed such an intention publicly? No. Has he hinted it in private? No. Has he taken the most distant step towards it? By no means.—What foundation then is there for the charge?—None.—The EARL of SHELBURNE has desired to be tried by his conduct: in that his enemies can find no flaw; on the contrary, every day

day produces new proofs of his capacity, integrity, and public spirit — yet these wretched calumniators pretend to dive into his intentions.— I might with equal propriety say, that it is Mr. Fox's intention to commit any atrocious act that a fertile imagination can suggest.

As to Messieurs Vaughan and Oswald's negotiations, a little time will shew whether they have been ill employed. And surely, it is no more strange to see the son of the late Samuel Vaughan a Plenipotentiary, than to see the son of the late Lord HOLLAND promoting bills to prevent the embezzlement of the public money!

A THIRD reproach upon the EARL of SHELBURNE is, that he will advise the King to revive his negative to disagreeable Acts of Parliament, *if the People insist upon a Change of Representation.*—That the EARL of SHELBURNE will advise his Majesty never to give up his negative, which prerogative alone gives him a share in the Legislature, gives him the dignity of King, not the mere rank of Stadtholder, I believe as firmly as any man can do.—I will even venture to say, that his Lordship would glory in advising his Majesty, not to suffer the Monarchical  
part

part of the Constitution to be absorbed in the Aristocracy.

BUT that he will advise his Majesty to exert that prerogative, should the People insist upon a change in the Representation, or indeed on any occasion when the Parliament speaks the sense of the Nation, I utterly deny.

WHAT action, what assertion, what insinuation of the noble Lord can they adduce, on which to build so shameful a calumny?—But in proportion to their want of evidence is their confidence in assertion.

It is far from my intention to commit the name of the King in a controversy like the present; and however free my antagonists may make with his Majesty, I must own, that, with the EARL of SHELBURNE, I think there is some respect due to his person and character: but thus far may be safely affirmed, that even supposing by a *dato non concessa*, as the Logicians term it, his Lordship should offer such advice, it would be rejected.

THAT he never will offer it, is certain: that it would not be accepted by the *best of Princes*, as Messieurs BURKE and FOX lately called him, is equally certain.

BUT, to put this matter at once out of all doubt, what man in his senses would ever think of advising his Majesty to exert the prerogative in contradiction to the sentiments of the People, when at the same time he promoted a bill for arming that People, and thus gave them power to take immediate vengeance for their wrongs?

OUR Author proceeds.—“ LORD SHELburne “ is supposed to have *immersed* himself, in declaring that he would never listen to the sound of “ a King in Ireland.” *Besprew those fiends that palter with us in a double sense!*—Take Lord SHELburne’s sentiments as they really were.

ON the 17th of May 1782, his Lordship, after reading a message from the King, and two addresses from the Lords and Commons of Ireland in return to it, opened the business of the day;—and at the conclusion of his speech read two motions.

“ FIRST,



“ FIRST, That it is the opinion of this House,  
 “ that the Act of 6. George I. entitled, An Act for  
 “ the better securing the Dependency of Ireland  
 “ upon the Crown of Great Britain, ought to be  
 “ repealed.

“ SECOND, That it is the opinion of this House,  
 “ that it is indispensable to the interests and hap-  
 “ piness of both kingdoms, that the connection  
 “ between them should be established by mutual  
 “ consent, upon a solid and permanent footing; and  
 “ that an humble address be presented to his Ma-  
 “ jesty, that his Majesty will be graciously pleased  
 “ to take such measures, as his Majesty in his  
 “ Royal Wisdom shall think most conducive to  
 “ that important end.”

IN the course of the debate, a noble Lord  
 (Lord L———) started some doubts.—He  
 desired their Lordships would well weigh the  
 consequences of that important law. “ Ireland, said  
 “ he, is a dominion of the Crown of England,  
 “ and not a distinct country under the same Sove-  
 “ reign: the executive power of this State holds  
 “ the supreme authority of that, and the acts of  
 “ his Majesty with regard to that Country, must be  
 “ the acts of the King in Council. Unfortunate

“ will it be for both, should that situation ever be  
 “ changed, and should it ever be understood that  
 “ Ireland is only held as of the person of the King,  
 “ &c.”

IN reply to this, Lord SHELBURNE disclaimed the idea of treating England and Ireland as distinct dominions, united under one Sovereign. A doctrine so dangerous and unconstitutional had never entered his mind; nor was it to be found in the addresses of the Lords and Commons of Ireland, which expressly declare, that they desire all acts may pass under the Great Seal of Great Britain: the King therefore, as executive power of this country, will still hold the sovereignty of that, and all acts of state flow, as before, from his Majesty in his Privy Council of Great Britain. —Such was the language of the Earl of SHELBURNE; and what umbrage it could give the Irish nation, is not easy to find out.

LET us now hear Mr. Fox. The Right Honourable Secretary, on the same day in the House of Commons, began with saying, “ It had always been his opinion *out of office*, that it was downright tyranny to make laws for the internal government of people, who were not represented among those by whom such laws were made. It was true, nevertheless, that he was  
 not

not an enemy to the Declaratory Act which had been passed relative to America ; yet his principles were not inconsistent or incompatible with that Act. He had always made a distinction between internal and external legislation ; and though it would be tyranny to attempt to enforce the former, in countries not represented in the British Parliament, yet he was clear that the latter *was in reason and policy annexed to the British Legislature*. This right of prerogative or supremacy, he was convinced, would never have given umbrage to any part of the British Empire, if it had been used solely for the good of the Empire ; but when it was made an instrument of tyranny and oppression, it was not to be thought wonderful, that it should excite discontents, murmurings, and opposition. When local legislatures were established in different parts of the Empire, it was clear that it was for this purpose, that they might answer all municipal ends ; and the great superintending power of the State ought not to be called into action, but in aid of the local legislature, and for the good of the Empire at large. Had Ireland never been made to feel this power (of external legislature) as a curse, she never would have complained of it ; and the best  
and

and most effectual way to have kept it alive, would have been not to have made use of it."

THIS language seems explicit enough, and MR. Fox is clear, that in reason and policy there is a power annexed to the British Legislature, which a weak or wicked Minister might, when he pleased, make Ireland feel as a curse. He, good man! would never use it to their prejudice. But how were the Irish to be certain, that every future Minister would be as upright, as patriotic, as the Right Honourable Secretary? Yet he had his motives. If I might hazard a conjecture, he then entertained some suspicions, that he could not carry his favourite point, of vesting the whole Royal Power in a Junto which he could govern; and therefore thought proper to scatter some sparks of fire, which, should he go out of office, he might blow up into a flame; if he remained in it, he might easily quench. With this view he first alarmed the Irish, by his distinction between external and internal legislation. He then attempted to rouse the pride of the English, by insinuating that the requisitions of the Sister-Kingdom were humiliating to Great-Britain; but it was the fault of the late Ministry, who had left it in the power of the Volunteers

to make such demands ; at the same time hinting, that the manner of their demand was neither modest, nor such as even he, though so cordially their friend, could entirely approve. Yet the Volunteers had acted with temper and moderation, *notwithstanding* their steadiness ; and he must declare, they had not done a single act for which they had not his veneration and respect.

Now let any man of candour, let even Mr. Fox himself, answer, Was this the language of a sincere friend, who wanted to do away all grounds of jealousy and suspicion, or that of an incendiary, whose aim was to foment them ? The event shews, that he had taken his measures with address and dexterity ; for Ireland is now as far from being satisfied as ever, and her discontent was awakened by this very speech.

LORD BEAUCHAMP, who seems to have foreseen what would soon happen, proposed to cut up the evil by the roots, by not barely repealing the Act of 6. Geo. I. (which would leave the question still undecided, and England in possession of the same right as before the said Act was passed) but inserting a counter Declaratory Clause in the repealing Act. His Lordship added, that the Act in question went only to appeals to the House of Lords,

Lords, and left them still open to the courts of law here, by writs of error ; and therefore advised that the whole ground of appeal should be done away. MR. FOX with his usual *finesse* eluded the proposal. He owned his approbation of the measure ; said that the method which the Irish had adopted, was not in his opinion the best, but it was the method demanded by the Irish themselves ; and he thought that the most gracious way in which their Rights should be acknowledged by a British Parliament.

THE Irish immediately perceived their mistake, and were provoked at the behaviour of the English Parliament. They said, and perhaps with some truth, that it was not generous, it was not friendly. “ Our aim was to secure to ourselves and to our posterity a free Constitution. For this purpose we thought the four requisitions we made were sufficient. The Parliament of England saw they were not sufficient ; and while they pretended to establish our freedom with the utmost generosity, and on the surest footing, insidiously took advantage of our oversight, to grant us only a precarious freedom of Legislation, which they might revoke when they saw convenient. While we thought that they had consented that

no appeal should lie from our Courts of Law to any foreign judicature; they granted us only freedom from appeal to their House of Peers, but left it still open to their Courts of Law.

THIS ground of complaint MR. FOX might certainly have taken away. He cannot plead inadvertence, or that he did not discern either the grievance or the remedy, for both were clearly pointed out to him; yet he would not lend his aid radically to cure those wounds which he must clearly perceive were then ready to bleed afresh.

WHO will not say after this, that MR. FOX highly merits the popularity we are so boastfully told he has in Ireland?—He certainly deserves a statue from both Nations for his service to each in this affair.

IF it be any merit in the ROCKINGHAM Administration that they granted to the Irish precisely what they asked, and in the manner that they asked it, LORD SHELburne has at least an equal share with MR. FOX.—LORD SHELburne said, that he considered Ireland and England as inseparably connected; not as two distinct dominions, whose only bond of union

was their being under one Sovereign, which is the state of England and Hanover : each was bound in all cases to promote the interest, to defend the rights, and avenge the injuries of the other. This was clearly his meaning, when he used the expression by which, says the Author of *The Defence*, he was supposed to *immerse* himself; and MR. Fox asserted precisely the same thing, when he moved a Resolution in the Committee of the House of Commons that day, declaring, “ that it  
 “ is the opinion of this Committee, that the In-  
 “ terests of the two Kingdoms are inseparable, and  
 “ that their connexion ought to be founded on a  
 “ solid and permanent basis.”

BUT LORD SHELburne did not say, that the British Legislature had in reason and sound policy a right of supremacy over that of Ireland, either externally or internally; he did not endeavour to stint the generosity of the Peers, and make them comply with the requisitions of the Irish with backwardness and reluctance, by insinuating that the concessions were humiliating to Great Britain, or demanded in an improper and insolent manner :—in this, therefore, his Lordship shewed himself more a friend to both Countries than the Right Honourable Commoner.—On what, then,

can



can the popularity of Mr. Fox be founded ? Certainly not on his private virtues.—Or is it on the compliments he paid to the Volunteers ?—The People of Ireland are indeed of an open, generous, warm disposition, and professions of esteem, respect, and friendship will soon win their hearts. But what Mr. Fox gave with one hand he took away with the other : certain it is, that his popularity, if he be popular in Ireland, is built upon a very slight foundation.

No man in the least acquainted with the world, will be much elevated with the possession, or depressed with the loss of that precarious, that imaginary good : it is often acquired without merit ; it is often lost for doing real services.—The most frequent, the most sure method of gaining it, is consulting the passions, not the interests of the People. By that means a man may with a little address soon become their idol ; but at that moment he becomes their slave. As their idol, they believe that there is nothing impossible for him ; they think him endowed with a kind of omnipotence. As their slave, he is to exert that omnipotence in executing all their commands, in gratifying all their wishes, however absurd, extravagant, or impracticable ; and the instant they find themselves disappointed, the object of their adoration

adoration becomes that of their contempt and abhorrence.—It is, indeed, what no wise man will covet, what no honest man will court ; for, instead of enabling him to do real service to his Country, it is most commonly an insuperable bar in his way.—The real Patriot looks only to the rectitude of his own conduct. If his conscience tells him that he has acted as he ought to do ; if he be convinced that the measures he pursued, were the best that could be adopted for the benefit of his country ; he feels not much anxiety whether the People censure or applaud him.—*Non civium ardor prava jubentium — mente quatit solida.*—If we look into History, we shall find in all ages, that those who entertained the best wishes for their Country, who did it the most essential service, generally enjoyed the least share of popularity :—witness Aristides and Phocion, in Greece ; the two Cato's, in Rome ; and, to come to modern times, did the Duke of Sully, the saviour of France, ever enjoy half the popularity of the two Guises, who brought their Country to the brink of destruction ? In England, did the patriotic Hampden, the steady, the intrepid Sidney, those champions of real Liberty, ever meet with half the applause which was bestowed on the artful, the aspiring, the unprincipled Cromwell, whose

whose sole aim was his own aggrandizement on the ruins of Liberty ?

POPULARITY, then, is of itself no proof of merit ; nor the want of it, of demerit.

BUT we have another reason assigned for his Lordship being unpopular in Ireland.—It seems, according to the Author of *The Defence*, that his Lordship forfeited his word and honour, solemnly given to some of his tenants, on occasion of renewing their leases.—But what evidence does the Author of *The Defence* bring in proof of this charge ?—He says, that it is known in Paris, in Vienna, and in Dublin.—But is it known in the County of Kerry ?—On that head he has thought proper to be silent. But he has demonstrated it in a note.—He *undertakes to prove* any man who should contradict the preceding anecdote, a *liar*.—Who dare, after this, deny it ? He undertakes to prove it : *ergo*, it is true.—This mode of reasoning, however extraordinary it may appear to vulgar minds, is very common with this Gentleman ; yet some sceptics may be inclined at least to suspend their belief, till the production of those precious proofs which he keeps so carefully in *petto*. Certainly, when a charge is brought forward, when an allegation is made, it

3

ought

ought to be supported by some other proofs than the bare words, or even menace of the accuser.—Why then are they withheld?—A heavy charge immediately affecting the private character of a Peer is published to the world, and the People of England are to look for a confirmation of it in Dublin, Paris, or Vienna: yet, supposing they had an inclination to verify the transaction, they are not told of a single person, even in those places, distant as they are from the County of Kerry, to whom application can be made for that purpose.—Assertions of such a kind, and made in such a manner, deserve no notice.—The Writer of this pamphlet declares in the most explicit and positive manner, that he has so great confidence in his Lordship's honour and integrity, as never to put it in the balance with the unsupported affirmation of an anonymous writer or writers: he therefore, without scruple, affirms the whole to be a direct falsehood, and shall dismiss it with the contempt which it and the Author of it deserve.

It is true, it might be easy to retort. MR. Fox (to borrow a phrase from his patrons) has glass windows of his own, and therefore should be  
cautious

cautious of indulging himself or his friends in the licence of throwing stones.

It must be owned he has not many tenants, but he has creditors in abundance ; and how often had he forfeited his word ? What shifts—what tricks—But I spare myself the disgusting task of displaying to the public his mean dishonourable transactions on that head ; they who would be informed, may enquire in *Duke's Place*.

THE Author of *The Defence* has been at some pains to trace Lord SHELBURNE's descent from Sir William Petty. I dare say that his Lordship, so far from being ashamed of his ancestor, glories in this founder of his family.—Sir WILLIAM PETTY, like Sir STEPHEN FOX, owed his fortune to his merit.—There was this difference, and this only : That the name of the one will endure while Time lasts ; the name of the other is already almost consigned to oblivion.—So obscure, indeed, was Sir Stephen's origin, that though he had served, I think, under four different reigns, and been dexterous enough to ingratiate himself with every Monarch, with every Administration, however contradictory were their dispositions, or political maxims ;—so obscure was his origin, that even Lord Chesterfield

terfield was not acquainted with it.—He says, that it was mean.—It was not. Sir Stephen was a younger son of a younger branch of a family, whose origin a Herald could trace from a younger brother of a Norman Baron.

THE Earl adds, that this Sir Stephen gained a fortune the Lord knows how.—Another mistake—I have shewn how.—It is true, that Sir Stephen did not, like Sir William Petty, think proper to give the History of his Life in his Will; but that was from a principle of modesty.—However, all the world knows how HENRY Fox, the RIGHT HONOURABLE SECRETARY's *ennobled* Father, got his fortune; and it must be allowed, that the SON does not degenerate. *Tu nunc eris alter ab illo*, may with the strictest justice be said of the SON.

BUT, to drop this subject, and return to *The Defence*, &c.—With that distinguished erudition which this Gentleman so ostentatiously displays, he tells us that Seneca speaks of *Somebody* who wrote a Treatise upon the Benefits a Man may receive from his Enemies;—and he adds, that the writer alluded to by the Philosopher *should* have been a politician.—What this *Somebody* *should*

*should* have been, I will not pretend to determine; for though Plutarch, who was a Philosopher, and not a Politician, has impertinently, it seems, written a Treatise on the same subject, I confess I know nothing of this pretended politician: yet I could wish he had given us some hints, in what part of Seneca's works he is to be found, that we might have judged, whether he was what he *should* have been, or not. However, it is added, that the Noble-Earl yields to no mortal in the full practice of this best of maxims, "To make use of his foes as well as friends." 'Tis shrewdly aimed; but while this Gentleman takes a stand to shoot at the Earl of SHALBURNE, his arrow glances on his own friends. They have owned, that they looked upon his Lordship, from the beginning, as their enemy; yet this enemy they have made use of for their own benefit, even as they said CATO would of CATILINE, or as CICERO actually did of ANTONY. They used him as a Lord in waiting, or a Gentleman Usher, to introduce them into the Royal presence. When that was effected, he was to walk out; though, for decency's sake, they could not immediately shut the door of the Cabinet against him. When such was their proceeding, how

can they blame his Lordship, even had he turned their own arts against them? Yet he was far above it; he joined them heartily in every measure which could tend to the benefit of this country; but he would not join with Mr. Fox and his colleagues, in offering *carte blanche* to the enemies of Great-Britain, though the odium of the measure might have been thrown upon the late Ministry. He would not join them in overturning the Constitution, in order to engross all power to themselves and their creatures. Such was his behaviour; such was theirs.

BUT let us hear *The Defence*. “From his foes  
 “the Northites he got a principle; from his friends  
 “the Foxites he got a theatre to put this principle into action.” Now, that the Foxites were his friends, we have the most uncontrovertible evidence, their own acknowledgement. What principle did he get from the Northites? As to that, we are left in the dark. Mr. Fox, it is alledged, said, “There are things that operate upon a  
 “man’s belief, that are not demonstrable. I cannot absolutely prove to this House, what I am  
 “in my own mind convinced of, that the Earl of  
 “SHELburne entertains views inimical to this  
 “country.” What a pity Mr. Fox did not state those



those things that operated upon his belief, that it might be seen, whether they would in a similar manner operate upon that of the House of Commons ! That he did not think expedient.

MR. FOX affirmed, he had his reasons ; and the House were to take their validity upon his word. To say that this is a bare assertion, and comes far *wide* of proof, and consequently of conviction, the Author of *The Defence* maintains to be a mere quibble ; but, unluckily for him, the unprejudiced part of the world think it is something more, and will never be convinced by bare assertions without proof. However, this Gentleman will condescend to prove it effectually by common sense, and he sets about it with great pomp and ceremony.

“IDEM PER ALTERUM, says he, is true wisdom.” I say, not always, unless the two things have an intimate connection : however, let us hear him out. “ How can I tell, or how can you tell, by  
 “ what variation of manner the same end may be  
 “ pursued, or by what dexterity of Ministerial  
 “ disguise the great original object may be con-  
 “ cealed from the vulgar eye ; that object which  
 “ begun with Lord BUTE, which Lord SHELburne

“ grasps to his bosom, and will, if possible, de-  
 “ posit in its long expected sanctuary. The shape  
 “ may be changed ; but (says the Author) I  
 “ have no doubt of the *similitude* of the sub-  
 “ stance.”

THIS is common sense with a witness ! Yet to plain men, it may appear a mere piece of jargon ; and wags may compare it with the famous sorites in John Bull, from which the Author of *The Defence* seems to have borrowed this notable piece of argumentation.

To expect any thing better, indeed, in such a cause, would be unreasonable. Let us try, however, to decypher his meaning. After much labour and study, all I can make of it is this : “ How can you tell, or how can I tell, but the Earl of SHELBURNE entertains views inimical to his country ? For my part, I have no doubt of it : *ergo*, he has such views.” O rare logic !—But there is something stronger still to come. “ Those  
 “ who are most friendly, and those who are but  
 “ lukewarm to the Noble Lord, have strong suspi-  
 “ cions.” The first part of the assertion I deny : those who are friendly to Lord SHELBURNE entertain no such suspicions. The luke-warm are  
 not

not friends ; they can only be looked upon, as they generally are, to be secret enemies. “ But his “ opponents, to a man, are decided, that he is an “ enemy to his country ;” therefore, again, Lord *SHELburne* is an enemy to his country. *Q. E. D.* May his Lordship, while he continues to act as he has hitherto done, ever meet with such opponents !

AFTER thus proving that the Northites gave him a principle, we are next told, that the Foxites gave him a scene. But the Foxites themselves confess, that it was his Lordship gave them a scene : he carried on the negociation for the New Ministry ; he introduced them into the Cabinet ; he placed the Marquis of *Rockingham* at the head of the Treasury, though he might have presided at that Board himself ; he convinced his Majesty, that, considering the circumstances of the nation, the Independence of America must be given up, and thus reconciled him to their favourite measure. Such were the services his Lordship did to the Foxites ; but these services filled them with jealousy and suspicion. They knew that his Lordship would not go all lengths with them ; that he would support their measures, only so far as they were beneficial to  
this

this country ; and that the moment they attempted to unsettle the Constitution, and betray the interests of their Sovereign, that moment he would shew himself their determined foe. Those of them who preferred the public good to their private ambition, have kept their places, and acted with his Lordship : I need mention only the Duke of RICHMOND. Will the Author of *The Defence*, will Mr. Fox himself say, that this Nobleman would act with the Earl of SHELburne, did he entertain views inimical to this country ?

WE are told, that his Lordship left the weight of Opposition on the Duke of RICHMOND. Even supposing he did, it was a burden his Grace had no objection to bear, nor did he ever object to the Earl on that head. I will willingly subscribe to every thing that can be said in praise of his Grace. His steadiness, his perseverance, his integrity, his sincerity, have always been unimpeached ; and he has given the noblest proofs of them : he has shewn that measures, not men, are his object. When by insidious arts he had been taught to entertain a suspicion of the noble Earl, he would not for that reason quit the service of his country : the important crisis, he

was

was of opinion, called for the assistance of every honest man. He had some doubts concerning the Physician that was called in; but he would not therefore desert the Patient: he would be a witness to every step that was taken, he would carefully examine every prescription, he would inspect every remedy that was administered; and the moment that he perceived the least error, he would do his utmost to expose it, and prevent its fatal effects. With that plainness of speech, with that openness of manner, which have ever been the characteristics of his Grace, he told the Earl of SHELBURNE, at the close of last session, that he held it to be his duty to keep a watchful eye on Ministers, and not to suffer a single act of theirs to pass unexamined. The noble Earl most readily acceded to the proposal. He declared it was from his measures, not from his promises, that he expected to derive support; and if they should not be found to deserve it, he would not repine at not finding it. What has been the consequence? After the most important steps have been taken, during the whole course of a Negotiation more difficult than, perhaps, ever an English Minister had to carry on; his Grace has declared in Parliament, that he and the whole Cabinet approved of the noble Earl's conduct.

conduct. He said, the most perfect unanimity reigned among them ; they fully understood, and were perfectly satisfied with each other. The suspicions of the Duke of RICHMOND, who must have been privy to every measure that was taken, he has candidly owned were groundless ; he has given his unreserved plaudit to the Minister with whom MR. FOX refused to act ; whom MR. BURKE represented as a wolf, eager to devour the Nation.

IN this instance, the Duke of RICHMOND has, indeed, given a shining example of the noblest patriotism, of the sublimest virtue. His conduct has been diametrically opposite to that of MR. FOX, and I leave the reader to form the conclusion.

WE have next in *The Defence* a dreadful charge against his Lordship, as not being possessed of the powers of oratory, particularly in reply. Though the powers of oratory are certainly valuable, I am far from thinking them essentially necessary to a Minister.

DEMOSTHENES was undoubtedly much more superior to Phocion, as a speaker, than MR. FOX  
is

is to the Earl of SHELBURNE ; yet Phocion was infinitely the better statesman.

THE eloquence of Demosthenes hurried his country to destruction. The wisdom of Phocion warded off that destruction as long as it was possible. But he must be a bold man indeed, who will deny his Lordship's merit, even in this way.

It would be misemploying my own time, and that of my reader, to examine particularly all the ribaldry which the impotent malice of our Author and his friends has thrown out against his Lordship, for what he *trusted* the noble Earl would do. Facts speak for themselves. His Lordship's conduct has been the very reverse of what they wished ; it has proved the falshood of their most confident assertions ; and they must now take to themselves the disgrace that always attends those impostors who attempt to delude the people, and in the hour of danger fill a nation with discord and distraction by false prophecies.

I SHALL therefore pass over all those idle surmises concerning the stretches of power of which

M

they

they say his Lordship *will* be guilty ; the undue influence that he *will* exert over Parliament ; as well as the ready submission both Houses *will* pay to that influence, in order to bring about the final ruin of their country. I shall not even take notice of those dreadful cruelties, they tell us on their own authority, he *would* have committed on the harmless, innocent rioters in 1780, had he been then in power.

BUT I must not pass over the mention made of the motion relative to Mr. Rigby in June last.

AFTER applying to Parliament a quotation from a Latin author, *vicit in acido ingenio pravum consilium*, the author adds, “ Was this great and  
 “ shining feature of Parliament *impaired*, or al-  
 “ tered, *upon* the motion relative to Mr. Rigby  
 “ last June ? So far from it, that the House, which  
 “ for two months before exhibited a *solitary aspect*  
 “ of *depopulated benches*, could scarcely contain the  
 “ crowd of Senators, who came *accoutred* with wry  
 “ faces, “ *like Herod’s bang-dogs in old tapestry*,”  
 “ to give a home-thrust to that impious Missionary  
 “ who threatened ruin to their ancient tenets, and  
 “ meditated the destruction of their old religion.”

THIS



THIS piece of pompous jargon, about a shining feature being *impaired upon a motion*, and a House exhibiting a *solitary aspect*, not of its own but of *depopulated* benches, I leave for the Author of *The Defence* to put into English.

BUT what an unlucky circumstance was it, that CHARLES FOX should be one of the leaders of this pack of *Herod's bang-dogs*, who came *accoutred with wry faces*, to give the *home-thrust* to that *impious Missivary* the Attorney-General. It must be owned the case was critical. MR. FOX was a reformer; but his father had been a Paymaster, and no reformer. Let us hear how he will acquit himself in this affair, where Honour seemed to stand on one side, Interest on the other. The Attorney-General came into the House, brandishing a tremendous two-edged sword, with which he vowed he would crop the ears of all Paymasters past, present, and to come; but first and foremost, Mr. Rigby's. MR. FOX was afraid of a back-stroke, and therefore insisted upon the weapon being returned to its sheath. He said, "He did not join with his learned friend, in the propriety of the declaration he had thrown out. In the first place, he contended, as he had often

done before, that when a balance of Public Money lay in the hands of a Public Accomptant, all the Public had a right to expect from him was, that whenever the money should be called for, it should be forth-coming; and what he did with it was nothing to the Public, provided he had it always ready to answer the calls of the Public." This is, no doubt, excellent doctrine; but I should be glad to know how a Paymaster, or any other man, can make use of the public money, without putting it *out* of his hands; and when once out, how can he be sure that he can always have it ready to answer the calls of the Public, upon a sudden emergency? Supposing that he vests it in the funds; when the Public have the most occasion for money, the funds are generally lowest: and perhaps, it may not always be in the power of a Paymaster, however opulent, to make good the losses he must sustain, by selling out at a low price. The case is still worse, if he lets it out of his hands upon private security: such debts are seldom payable on demand: let the exigencies be ever so pressing, the Public must wait till the person with whom the money was deposited can call it in.

BUT

BUT MR. FOX tells us, “ this doctrine was pointed only at *past times* : to *future* regulations on that subject he had no objection. He requested, however, that his learned friend would *draw some line*, and leave room for some *prescription*.” Yet, alas ! in the affair of the Duke of Portland, the Right Honourable Mr. Fox was an utter foe to *prescription*. “ That is a different case,” says the Secretary ;—and so it certainly is.

HE goes on : “ If a limit is not fixed, beyond which the enquiry is not to extend, it would always be in the power of the King’s Attorney-General to keep in constant alarm, and the worst state of slavery, all those who had ever filled any public office, or their *descendants* and executors for a century. He wished his learned friend would fix this point. *It might happen* that a public accomptant might acquire a great fortune by a fair and honest use of public money.” Ah Charles ! But I beg pardon, it *might* so happen.—“ It might also happen, that *his descendants, by their folly and imprudence, completely dissipated and destroyed this fortune*.” Very true.—“ Were these descendants to be called upon, to account for the profits made by their ancestors ? Were the descendants of Sir Robert Walpole  
and

and the Duke of Chandos to be called to an account?" Far be it; no, nor the descendants of HENRY FOX; or else—*multa absurda sequerentur*.

IN page 58 of *The Defence*, we are bid with much ostentation to look to the effect of the Negotiation at Paris, to the rejection of all overtures from Sir GUY CARLETON, and the refusal of a passport from Philadelphia to his Secretary. 'Tis true, the French would not treat, because MR. FOX had been at particular pains to inform all Europe, that the English were utterly unable to continue the war any longer; and that it would be an easy matter, not only to reduce, but even annihilate the power of that nation, which had but lately towered above them in such an envied height of grandeur. The Earl of SHELBURNE has convinced them, that MR. FOX's word was not in that respect to be depended upon. When the Americans refused to treat, (if we may judge of them by their subsequent conduct) it seems to have been for no other reason than that they looked upon MR. FOX to be the then ostensible Minister, and they had no great opinion of his sincerity. As soon as they

were

were convinced that he had no more share in the Administration, they not only treated, but concluded a Treaty.

AFTER libelling the Parliament of Great-Britain in the most infamous manner, our Author endeavours to bring his Lordship in for a share of the guilt, by telling us, that in 1770 he declared, “ that the *Majority of the House of Commons were T—s.*” The reader has already seen a slight specimen of the transactions of that Parliament. It is now no more—Peace to its manes !—and the less that is said of it, the better. Yet it is not a little extraordinary, he should bring this charge against the Earl of SHELBURNE, when he has asserted, “ That the Majority of the “ present P——t will be T—s, the moment “ his Lordship bids them.” The misfortune for him is, that in his Postscript he says, “ The “ greatest and wisest men of the nation affirmed “ the Majority of that P——t to be Traitors.”

He gives us a pompous display of the Acts passed during Mr. Fox's (if it must be Mr. Fox's) Three Months Administration. These Acts were, doubtless, highly laudable and highly beneficial. But may not his Lordship claim his full share  
in

in that important business ? May he not with the greatest justice say to Mr. Fox, and the Gentlemen who seceded with him, “ I have done many things without you. Without me you did nothing.”

BUT Lord SHELBURNE, it seems, said, that all that had been done in the matter of Reform, was but little in comparison of what remained to be done.—In this his Lordship certainly spoke truth : every real friend to his Country must join in the assertion, as did the Duke of Richmond.—Hear his Grace’s sentiments. On the day of prorogation he said, “ that though he thought as respectfully of the different bills that had been brought into Parliament for the Reform, as any noble Lord in that House, he must at the same time say, that they fell so far short of what remained still to be done, that, with the noble Lord near him (Lord SHELBURNE), he must look upon them rather as a beginning than the completion of that great work of Reformation, for which the Ministry stood committed.”

It is unnecessary to take notice of the sneers thrown out against the people in general, as insensible

sensible to the losses they have sustained in America. MR. Fox and his friends ought always to mention the People with respect, especially as his sole dependence is upon that People, who are treated in *The Defence* with so much contempt.—Besides, the charge is not true: the People were struck with sorrow, at the same time that they were filled with indignation, on the news of the misfortune which befel General Cornwallis. All of them; I mean, except the Foxites, as they are stiled in *The Defence*; who, with their leader, laughed at the calamity of their Country, and “mocked when her fear came, “because they were her friends!”—Sallust is quoted to set before us the example of the Romans, on the news of the capture of one of their armies in the Jugurthine war. If our Author had been at the trouble to look a little further, he would have seen that the Historian, instead of commending his countrymen for their dejection on this occasion, blames their pusillanimity, and mentions it as a mark of their degeneracy.

THEIR ancestors, after the Battle of Cannæ, which really shook their empire to the center, thanked even the General, who by his ill conduct

had brought that calamity upon them, because he had not *despaired of the Commonwealth*—MR. Fox actually despaired of the Commonwealth, and was even simple enough to tell our enemies that he did.—The Earl of SHELBURNE did not despair of the Commonwealth, and convinced those enemies that we had still resources.—Which of the two deserves best at the hands of the Public ?

OUR Author now falls into a violent paroxysm of rage, because, on the night that the melancholy news came from America, the nobility and gentry went to the Opera, instead of going to the Play.—How this would have mended the matter, I cannot determine ; nor am I so much interested in any of the Theatres, as to attempt to decide which should have the preference in a time of public calamity, Drury-Lane, Covent-Garden, or the Hay-Market.

NEXT follows a vindication of MR. Fox, for appearing, when Minister, upon the Hustings, in favour of a Candidate at the late Westminster Election. This, our Author tells us, was intirely justifiable in MR. Fox, because LORD NORTH recommended by letter a certain Candidate to his friends in a certain Borough ; and to shew his consistency,



sistency, rails most furiously at Lord NORTH for that *manœuvre*. It is not my design to attempt the least vindication of his Lordship, or his measures; but I cannot help thinking him a little hardly dealt by in this affair. If it was unwarrantable in Lord NORTH, while in office, privately to recommend a friend of his to the Electors of Milbourne-Port, common sense must dictate, that it was equally unwarrantable in Mr. Fox, while in office, publickly to recommend *his* friend to the Electors of Westminster. But there is a salvo: Mr. Fox acted not as a Minister, but as a private man. And might not Lord NORTH urge the same plea?—No.—Why?—Because Mr. Fox is a Saint; Lord NORTH is a Sinner.—Now it would be impious to say, that Sinners have privileges equal to Saints.

ALAS for his Lordship! He may now see the difference between Mr. Fox and him, and that, according to the proverb, “One man may steal a horse, while another dares not look over the hedge.”

COME we now to the grand affair of Colonel Barre’s pension, which will not detain us long.—When first proposed, it had the warmest approbation both of Mr. Fox and Mr. BURKE, and

they never discovered that it was wrong till the Colonel accepted the Office of Paymaster, on MR. BURKE's secession. *Hinc prima mali labes*. In a moment the Colonel lost all his virtue, all his merit. —I think, in Congreve's *Way of the World* Mirabel tells Millamant, that Beauty is the sole gift of the Lover, and that she is no longer handsome than he thinks her so.—What Mirabel says of Beauty, MR. FOX and his Associates say of Integrity, Wisdom, Virtue, Patriotism, and every merit: they are their gift; they bestow them on whom they please; they take them away when they please.

WHEN the ROCKINGHAM Administration was first formed, MR. FOX was loud in their panegyric. In them was centered all the wisdom, all the virtue, all the good sense of the nation; he excepted none out of the number: they were all,—all honourable men. Colonel BARRE had his share of the incense, and even the Earl of SHELBURNE was not excluded.—After the death of the Marquis he continued the same strain.—“The Nation needed never despair—They were a band of virtuous men.” Yet, if we may now believe him, he even at that time knew the Majority to be neither more nor less than a pack of knaves;

knaves; for they had before out-voted him in the Cabinet on a question, upon which depended the salvation of Great Britain, and he had determined to wash his hands of them: either they must out, or he.—However, this was a resolution which he most politicly kept to himself. Things were not yet ripe for an eclaircissement. But though he held them up as Gods to the vulgar, he trusted it would soon be in his power to convince them, that their apotheosis depended solely upon him; and should they be so uncivil as again to thwart him, he would make every one of them *subscribe himself a Devil*.

MATTERS did not turn out as he expected. His Majesty, who, as MR. BURKE says, is the *best of Princes*; who, MR. FOX assures us, confers blessings upon his People with unparalleled grace, and is a Monarch endowed with justice, discernment, and mercy; had discernment enough to see MR. FOX's design of absorbing the Monarchical part of the Constitution in the Aristocratical, and in justice to himself and his successors, in mercy to his People, put a stop to the new Minister's career.

To return to the Colonel's Pension: the moment that MR. FOX resigned, he discovered it

to be a most infamous lavishing of the public money on a worthless object; and, forgetting that both he and Mr. BURKE had so very lately given it their sanction, raised a hideous clamour against the proposer of it, as guilty of little less than Treason to his Country; though by that they must charge themselves as accomplices in that treason. This traitor, they said, was the Earl of SHELburnE. The Earl owned that he advised the King to grant the Pension; but he affirmed the measure originated with the Marquis of ROCKINGHAM, and was happy to have in his possession that noble Lord's Letter on the subject, in which he proposed the Pension as a compensation to the Gentleman upon whom it was to be settled, for having given up his pretensions to the Pay-Office.—That Gentleman himself objected to the Pension; he wished rather for some provision in the line of his profession; but had at last given way to the desires of the noble Marquis.—Now, what evidence could be opposed to this Letter?—The Author of *The Defence* flatly contradicts it, and gives the lie direct, not only to the Earl of SHELburnE, but to the Marquis himself.—His witnesses are Mr. BURKE and Lord JOHN CAVENDISH.

LET us hear MR. BURKE.—He knew that the noble Marquis thought himself bound for it, as he had in the year 1766 left out the Honourable Colonel by mistake in a list of Promotions.—Thus said MR. BURKE on the 9th of July.—And this is a strong collateral proof of the Earl's assertion; for the Marquis of ROCKINGHAM was a man of that integrity and honour, that he would not stand in need of a prompter to induce him to perform, as soon as in his power, what he thought himself bound to do in 1766. To alledge, as both MR. FOX and MR. BURKE did, that the Marquis had no particular connexion with the Colonel, who was not of his party, as an argument, that therefore the Pension did not originate with him, is, in fact, libelling the memory of their deceased noble Friend: it is saying, in other words, that he would not spontaneously, nor without sollicitation, do what he really thought himself bound to do, unless the person to be benefited was of his party.

Two days after, MR. BURKE thought proper to tell the House, when they were considering a question intirely different, that he understood it had been said *somewhere* by *somebody*, “ that the  
“ proposition for giving a Pension to Colonel

“ BARRE had originated with the Marquis of  
 “ ROCKINGHAM, and that it was bestowed as a  
 “ compensation for having given up his preten-  
 “ sion to the Pay-Office, on the Change of Ad-  
 “ ministration.” To this assertion, says Mr.  
 BURKE, “ I must give a direct and flat contradiction.  
 What assertion?—Mr. BURKE is a connoisseur in  
 language, and he must know that he had joined  
 two assertions in their nature intirely different.  
 The first of them was, that the proposition for  
 giving a Pension to the Colonel originated with  
 the Marquis of ROCKINGHAM.—Of this there  
 was no evidence but the Marquis’s own Letter,  
 and Mr. BURKE did not think that worth his  
 notice.

THE second assertion was, that the Pension  
 was given to Colonel BARRE as a compensation  
 for his having given up his pretensions to the  
 Paymastership. For this too there is the evidence  
 of the Letter.—But it is no such thing, says Mr.  
 BURKE.—It could not be given as a compensation,  
 because it was not an *adequate* compensation.—  
 “ The man who had made such a bargain would  
 “ have been an arrant fool.”—It is granted.—  
 But there was no bargain made. The Colonel  
 had not the honour of being connected with the  
 Marquis

Marquis, therefore his name was omitted by mistake in a list of promotions.—The Marquis was sorry.—An opportunity of serving him again offered:—he had pretensions to the Office of Paymaster; it was what he thought his services and the sacrifices he had made deserved; and being a military man, it was in the line of his profession. But Mr. BURKE stepped in, and though not a military man, yet being in habits of intimacy with the Marquis, was therefore much fitter than any other person to be Paymaster. It may well be imagined, that neither the Colonel nor his friends were much pleased with this nomination.—Mr. BURKE and the Marquis were aware of it; and therefore, to make some, though, as Mr. BURKE has observed, far from an *adequate* compensation, they offered him a Pension. The Colonel would rather have chosen an employment; but that was not to be granted; he must take a Pension or nothing.—That Pension, therefore, which the Colonel, uncontradicted by them, says was not his choice, which they allow was not adequate to the Paymastership, must have originated from the principal, indeed it seems the only friend he had in Administration!—We have therefore resumption, probability, and positive written evidence to produce against the assertion of Mr. BURKE.

NOR will Lord JOHN CAVENDISH help them out: all that he could say was, that he never *understood* that the proposition for making the provision of £. 3,200 a-year for Colonel BARRE had come from the Marquis of ROCKINGHAM: this much he was sure of, that it was not the *price* of the resignation of that Gentleman's pretensions to the Pay-Office.

THAT it was not the *price* of his resignation, is plain; Lord SHELBURNE never said that it was. The Marquis of ROCKINGHAM indeed proposed it as a *price*, but the Colonel refused it upon those terms; and at last accepted it from nearly the same motives that a creditor does ten shillings in the pound for his debt.

I HAVE now gone through every part of *The Defence* that appears worth notice. I have extenuated nothing, nor set down aught in malice. The charges I have brought against Mr. Fox are authenticated; and I leave the world to judge, whether he can have the least claim to the Confidence of the Nation as a Minister, or even to Esteem as an honest Man.

T H E   E N D.









